



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/646,330	08/22/2003	Nicholas M. Miller	MGM-10002/02	9681
25006	7590	09/06/2006	EXAMINER	
GIFFORD, KRASS, GROH, SPRINKLE & CITKOWSKI, P.C				BOUCHELLE, LAURA A
PO BOX 7021				
TROY, MI 48007-7021				
				ART UNIT
				PAPER NUMBER
				3763

DATE MAILED: 09/06/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/646,330	MILLER, NICHOLAS M.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Laura A. Bouchelle	3763	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 22 August 2003.
- 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-10 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-10 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date 12/9/03.

- 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
- 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

1. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

2. Claims 2, 8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. The term "relatively stiff materials" in claims 2, 8 is a relative term which renders the claim indefinite. The term "relatively stiff material" is not defined by the claim, the specification does not provide a standard for ascertaining the requisite degree, and one of ordinary skill in the art would not be reasonably apprised of the scope of the invention.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 1-10 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Shimamura et al (US 4737153) in view of Onik (US 5693011).

5. Shimamura discloses a reinforced catheter comprising an elongate flexible body 4 having a tip 2 with a plurality of openings 8 formed in the wall of the catheter, and a rigid helical support element 6 embedded in the wall (Abstract).

Art Unit: 3763

6. Independent claim 1 differs from Shimamura in calling for a cage member. Onik teaches a surgical suction catheter comprising an elongate flexible catheter having a cage member having a plurality of longitudinal stringers 44 and a plurality of annular rings 45 disposed about the intake apertures 36 to prevent the apertures from becoming clogged, thereby maintaining an open flow of material through the catheter (Col. 2, lines 45-50, 60-65). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to modify the catheter of Shimamura to include a cage member as taught by Onik to prevent the apertures from becoming clogged, thereby maintaining an open flow of material through the catheter.

7. Claims 4, 9 differ in calling for the stringers and the rings to be in a common cylindrical plane. Onik teaches that the cage member is in a common cylindrical plane to allow the catheter to have a low profile so that it can more easily pass through body lumens (Col. 3, lines 30-35). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to modify the catheter of Shimamura to have a cage in a common cylindrical plane as taught by Onik to allow the catheter to have a low profile so that it can more easily pass through body lumens.

8. Claim 6 differs from Shimamura in view of Onik in calling for an additional set of apertures and an additional cage over those apertures. This limitation is considered to be a duplication of parts. Mere duplication of parts has no patentable significance unless a new and unexpected result is produced by the inclusion of duplicate parts. See MPEP 2144.04. In the instant case, applicant has not disclosed that the additional apertures would result in a new and unexpected result, and therefore, the addition of a second set of apertures does not render the claim patentable over the prior art.

Conclusion

9. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Cruse (US 3308825) discloses a catheter with apertures in the sidewall and a cage member surrounding the apertures to prevent material from clogging the apertures.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Laura A. Bouchelle whose telephone number is 571-272-2125. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday 8-4.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Nicholas Lucchesi can be reached on 517-272-4977. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.


NICHOLAS D. LUCCHESI
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 3700

LAB

Laura A Bouchelle
Examiner
Art Unit 3763